

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, and 14 being independent. Claim 1 has been amended to address a minor informality. New claims 11-20 have been added to define additional aspects of the invention.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,411,771 B1 to Aotake (“Aotake”) in view of Japanese Publication No. 09-168109 A to Magai et al. (“Magai”).

Regarding claim 1, Aotake merely discloses a picture processing apparatus and method capable of carrying out a search of a desired scene. (See column 1, lines 9-12.) Specifically, Aotake discloses a personal computer comprising a main unit 31, a keyboard 21, as well as a mouse 22 and a display apparatus 51 for displaying a picture (column 5, lines 4-7). Main unit 31 further contains a hard disk 212 used for storing an operating system as well as software including application programs for carrying out processing such as recording, reproduction, editing and decoding a picture. (See column 9, lines 51-54.) Aotake further discloses a software called “Slipclip” which comprises application programs such as a slip video, a clip editor, a clip viewer, a video CD creator and a video CD copy tool. (See column 9, lines 59-61.) An encoder board 213 is disclosed which is a real time MPEG1 encoder capable of encoding a picture and sound in different video recording modes, including a mode of encoding at a high bit rate for high quality picture recording and a mode of recording at a low bit rate for transmission. The video recording modes are classified into four (4) different separate modes: “high”, “normal”, “long”, and “network”. A user, depending upon the intended use of the encoded video data, may select from one of these particular modes.

Aotake further discloses a tape setting dialogue box 321 which allows a user to enter in various video recording parameters. (See column 26, lines 22-27; Figure 8.) Tape setting dialogue box 321 further includes a video recording mode field 327 wherein a video recording mode is set. From a pull-down menu, a user may select among four (4) different modes which are enumerated in the menu in decreasing order, and as previously described are called “high”, “normal”, “long”, and “network”.

Conversely, Aotake fails to disclose, at least “displaying selectable candidates for a number of imaging pixels and image compression rates ... on a setting screen for setting an image quality,” and “changing a setting to the number of pixels and the image compression rate...,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s assertion that Aotake discloses the features in claim 1 quoted above in the Table of Figure 10. Figure 10 is merely a display table associating video recording modes with various video recording parameters, including image size. Figure 10 merely displays information and therefore is not a “setting screen.” Furthermore, Aotake only discloses a user setting the video recording mode in the graphical user interface (321) shown in Figure 8. Nowhere does Aotake disclose a user selecting a number of imaging pixels along with the video recording mode. Aotake merely discloses the user only setting the video recording mode and then displaying the image size associated with that particular mode.

Magai merely shows a digital camera having a recording mode which records files on a hard disk. The files may be read off the hard disk after a user selects the prescribed file using a cursor. (See solution paragraph) However, Magai fails to cure the deficiency of Aotake at least with respect to the features cited above in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aotake in view of Magai and USP 6,411,771 to Mizoguchi (“Mizoguchi”).

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 3, Mizoguchi merely teaches an image recording device which records images on a recording medium. The image recording device has a display unit (7) that displays the remaining amount of frames that may be recorded in memory (see column 3, lines 51-67; Figures 1 and 2). By virtue of their dependency from claim 1, claims 2 and 3 include all of the features recited in allowable claim 1 as provided in the arguments above, and are at least allowable for these reasons. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

The Examiner rejected claims 6-7 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi in view of Magai.

Regarding independent claim 6, Mizoguchi displays a digital camera which may take still or continuous photographs. More specifically, Mizoguchi teaches a compression ratio setting means (9) which switches the compression ratio of a compression circuit (3) among a high-quality picture, a standard mode and a multiple frame mode. Mizoguchi further discloses a display (7) which displays the used capacity and the remaining capacity of a memory storage unit. (See column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 14.)

Conversely, Mizoguchi fails to teach or suggest, at least, “a display control device that displays selectable candidates for a number of imaging pixels **and** image compression rates on the setting screen of said display device, and presenting combinations of selectable numbers of pixels and compression rates,” as recited in claim 6 (emphasis added).

Magai fails to cure the deficiencies of Mizoguchi in this respect. As Magai merely teaches a camera wherein files which may be reread from a hard drive by a user using a cursor (solution paragraph).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 6. Claims 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 6 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 6.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi in view of Magai and Aotake.

Regarding claim 8, Aotake merely teaches a video editing system which displays various video parameters associated with different video recording modes. Specifically, Aotake fails to disclose displaying “selectable candidates” for both “number of imaging pixels and image compression rates” as recited in claim 6 (emphasis added). Claim 8 by virtue of its dependency from claim 6 includes all of the features in allowable claim 6 and is allowable at least for these reasons provided for allowability of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 8.


### **Conclusion**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

  
DRA/JAV/jeb/slb  
0879-0315P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000